

Statistics of work distribution in periodically driven closed quantum systems

Anirban Dutta, Arnab Das, and K. Sengupta

Theoretical Physics Department, Indian Association for the Cultivation of Science, Jadavpur, Kolkata 700 032, India.

(Dated: November 13, 2014)

We study the statistics of the work distribution $P(w)$ in a d -dimensional closed quantum system with linear dimension L subjected to a periodic drive with frequency ω_0 . We show that the corresponding rate function $I(w) = -\ln[P(w)]/L^d$ after a drive period satisfies an universal lower bound $I(0) \geq n_d$ and has a zero at $w/N = Q$, where n_d and Q are the defect density and the residual energy generated during the drive and N denotes the total number of sites. We supplement our results by calculating $I(w)$ for a class of d -dimensional integrable models and show that $I(w)$ has oscillatory dependence on ω_0 originating from Stuckelberg interference generated due to double passage through critical point/region during the drive. We suggest experiments to test our theory.

PACS numbers: 05.70.Ln, 05.30.Rt, 71.10.Pm

The study of non-equilibrium dynamics of closed quantum systems has gained tremendous momentum in recent years due to available experimental test beds in the form of ultracold atom systems [1–3]. Such cold atoms serve as near perfect emulators of model Hamiltonians such as the Ising or the Bose-Hubbard models [4, 5]; in addition, they offer real time tunability of the parameters of the emulated Hamiltonians [6–8]. Consequently, they form perfect experimental platforms for studying non-equilibrium dynamics of these Hamiltonians near their quantum critical points. The initial focus of theoretical studies in this direction has been on sudden quench [9, 10] and ramp protocols [11–14]. However, later studies have also focussed on periodic protocols which involve multiple passage through these critical points [15–17] leading to dynamic freezing [15, 16] and novel steady states [17].

One of the quantities of interest in a many-body system driven out of equilibrium is its statistics of work distribution [18–23]. For thermodynamic systems in equilibrium, such a distribution follows the large deviation principle (LDP), namely $P(w) \sim \exp[-L^d I(w)]$, where $I(w)$ is the rate function characterizing the decay rate of $P(w)$ from its peak value which occurs at $w = \langle w \rangle$, where $\langle w \rangle$ is the average work done, and L is the linear dimension of the system. LDP is also shown to be valid for a large class of classical (quantum) non-equilibrium systems where the dynamics can be described by Markov processes (quench or ramp protocols)[19–21]. The latter works on quantum systems made general arguments about features of $I(w)$ for quench/ramp protocols and computed it explicitly for a class of one-dimensional (1D) integrable models [20, 21]. Such studies, however, were never extended for periodic protocols beyond two-level systems [23]; in particular, the effect of multiple passage through critical points due to the drive on $P(w)$ has not been studied.

In this work, we study the statistics of the work distribution $P(w)$ in a d -dimensional closed quantum system with linear dimension L subjected to a periodic drive with frequency ω_0 . We provide formally exact expression of the moment generating function, $G(u) =$

$\int dw P(w) \exp[-uw]$, for such a system after a drive period. Using the expression of $G(u)$ and basic elements of large deviation theory, we show that the corresponding rate function $I(w) = -\ln[P(w)]/L^d$ satisfies an universal lower bound $I(0) \geq n_d$, where n_d is the excitation (defect) density generated during the drive. We also show that for any periodic protocol $I(Q) = 0$ where Q is the residual energy. We supplement our results by explicit calculation of $I(w)$ for a class of integrable models in d -dimensions. Specific examples of these models include the Ising and XY models in $d = 1$ and the Kitaev model in $d = 2$. We show that $I(w)$ has an non-monotonic dependence on the drive frequency ω_0 which originates from the Stuckelberg interference generated during multiple passage of these systems through quantum critical points or lines during the drive. We suggest concrete experiments to test our theory. To the best of our knowledge, the existence of a universal lower bound for $I(0)$ linking it to an experimentally measurable quantity n_d has never been shown for a generic periodically driven quantum system; also, the relevance of quantum interference for statistics of work distribution of a closed quantum system has not been pointed out. Our work aims to fill up these major gaps in the existing literature.

Consider a time-dependent Hamiltonian $H[\lambda(t)] \equiv H$ where the parameter $\lambda(t)$ has periodic time dependence with a characteristics frequency ω_0 . At $t = 0$, $\lambda(0) = \lambda_0$ and $\lambda(t)$ returns to its starting value λ_0 after a drive cycle at $t_f = T_0 = 2\pi/\omega_0$. We denote the eigenstates and eigenenergies of H at $t = 0, t_f$ by $|\alpha\rangle$ and E_α ; they obey $H[\lambda_0]|\alpha\rangle = E_\alpha|\alpha\rangle$. For such a quantum system in the ground state ($|0\rangle$) of H at $t = 0$, w can take a set of values $E_\alpha - E_0$; thus $P(w)$ is obtained by summing over probabilities of w being equal to $E_\alpha - E_0$ for all α :

$$P(w) = \sum_{\alpha} P_{\alpha}(w) = \sum_{\alpha} P_{|0\rangle \rightarrow |\alpha\rangle} \delta(w - E_{\alpha} + E_0), \quad (1)$$

where $P_{|0\rangle \rightarrow |\alpha\rangle}$ denotes the probability that the system reaches the state $|\alpha\rangle$ at the end of a drive cycle; it can

be expressed in terms of the evolution operator S as

$$P_{|0\rangle \rightarrow |\alpha\rangle} = |\langle \alpha | S | 0 \rangle|^2, \quad S = T_t e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^t H[\lambda(t')] dt'}, \quad (2)$$

where T_t denotes time ordering. We note that one can write $S|0\rangle = |\psi(t_f)\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} |\alpha\rangle$, where c_{α} denotes the wavefunction overlap between $|\psi(t_f)\rangle$ with the eigenstate $|\alpha\rangle$; they satisfy $\sum_{\alpha} |c_{\alpha}|^2 = 1$. The probability of finding the system in the ground (starting) state after a drive cycle is $|c_0|^2$. The total energy absorbed during such a drive (residual energy) is thus given by $Q = L^{-d} \sum_{\alpha} (E_{\alpha} - E_0) |c_{\alpha}|^2$.

The moment generating function of $P(w)$, given by its Laplace transform, can be written as [20]

$$G(u) = \int dw \exp[-wu] P(w) = \sum_{\alpha} P_{|0\rangle \rightarrow |\alpha\rangle} e^{-(E_{\alpha} - E_0)u}.$$

Using Eq. 2 and the relations $H(t_f) = H(0) \equiv H(\lambda_0)$ and $S|0\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} |\alpha\rangle$, one can express $G(u)$ as

$$G(u) = |c_0|^2 + \sum_{\alpha \neq 0} |c_{\alpha}|^2 e^{-(E_{\alpha} - E_0)u}. \quad (3)$$

Next we show that $G(u)$ obtained in Eq. 3 satisfies LDP, *i.e.*, $G(u) = \exp[-L^d f(u)]$, where $f(u)$ is a concave function [18]. To do this, we express $f(u)$ as (Eq. 3)

$$f(u) = -L^{-d} \ln \left[|c_0|^2 + \sum_{\alpha \neq 0} |c_{\alpha}|^2 e^{-(E_{\alpha} - E_0)u} \right]. \quad (4)$$

To show that $f(u)$ is a concave function, we observe that $f(0) = 0$ and $f(\infty) = L^{-d} \ln[1/|c_0|^2] \geq 0$ [24]. Moreover,

$$\partial_u f(u) = L^{-d} \frac{\sum_{\alpha \neq 0} (E_{\alpha} - E_0) |c_{\alpha}|^2 e^{-(E_{\alpha} - E_0)u}}{|c_0|^2 + \sum_{\alpha \neq 0} |c_{\alpha}|^2 e^{-(E_{\alpha} - E_0)u}} \quad (5)$$

vanishes only at $u = \infty$ since $E_{\alpha} - E_0$ are positive definite for all α . Further $\partial_u^2 f(u) < 0$; so for any generic closed periodically driven quantum system, $f(u)$, computed after a drive cycle, is a concave function in $u \in (0, \infty)$. Thus $G(u)$ (and hence $P(w)$) obeys LDP.

Since $G(u)$ obeys LDP, one can relate rate function $I(w) = -L^{-d} \ln[P(w)]$ to $f(u)$ using the Gartner-Ellis theorem [18, 19, 25]:

$$I(\bar{w}) = f(u[\bar{w}]) - \bar{w} u[\bar{w}], \quad \partial_u f(u)|_{u=u[\bar{w}]} = \bar{w}, \quad (6)$$

where $\bar{w} = w/N$ and N is the number of sites. First, we use Eq. 6 to relate the zero of $I(w)$ to Q . To this end, we use Eq. 5 to obtain $Q = \partial_u f(u)|_{u=0}$. Using this observation, we note that Eq. 6 admits a solution $u[\bar{w}] = 0$ for $\bar{w} = Q$ leading to $I(Q) = f(0) = 0$.

Next, we obtain the universal lower bound for $I(0)$. To this end, we observe from Eq. 6 that $I(0) = f(u[0])$, where $\partial_u f(u)|_{u=u[0]} = 0$. From Eq. 5, we find that $u[0] = \infty$ which leads to $I(0) = f(\infty) = -L^{-d} \ln(|c_0|^2)$

[26]. To relate $|c_0|^2$ to n_d , we first consider a class of integrable systems for which $|c_0|^2 = \prod_{j=1, N} (1 - p_j)$ [27, 28]. Here p_j denotes the probability of deviation of the system from the ground state configuration corresponding to the index j . The physical interpretation of index j depends on the system; for example, it may represent either a spatial site or a momentum mode. Using this, one sees that $I(0) = -L^{-d} \sum_j \ln(1 - p_j) \geq Np/L^d$, where $Np = \sum_j p_j$. Next, we note that a finite p indicates non-zero weight of the system in the excited state; in an integrable system this amounts to formation of quasiparticle excitations whose number is Np and density $n_d = Np/L^d$. Thus for integrable systems $I(0) \geq n_d$. This result can be generalized for systems at finite temperature [28].

To relate I_0 to n_d for non-integrable systems, we divide T_0 into $\mathcal{M}$ intervals $\Delta t = T_0/\mathcal{M}$ with small enough Δt so that for any interval j , $H[\lambda(t)] \simeq (H[\lambda(t_j)] + H[\lambda(t_{j+1})])/2$. This leads to a time independent Hamiltonian, $H \simeq H[\lambda(t_j)] + \Delta t \partial_t H(t)|_{t=t_j}/2 = H_j + \Delta t V_j$, which describes the evolution of the system wavefunction at the j^{th} step. In what follows, we denote $|n_j\rangle$ and E_{n_j} to be instantaneous eigenstates and eigenenergies of H_j . For small enough Δt , $\Delta t V_j \ll H_j$; thus one can estimate the wavefunction evolution within any step using time-independent perturbation theory. Such a division of T_0 also allows one to write $S = \prod_{j=1, \mathcal{M}} \exp[-i(H_j + \Delta t V_j)\Delta t/\hbar]$. The system wavefunction, after $j-1$ evolution steps, can be written as $|\psi_j\rangle = \sum_{n_j} a_{n_j}^j |n_j\rangle$, where $a_{n_j}^j = \langle n_j | \psi_j \rangle$. Since $|\psi_{j+1}\rangle = \sum_{n_{j+1}} a_{n_{j+1}}^{j+1} |n_{j+1}\rangle$ and $|n_{j+1}\rangle$ can be related to $|n_j\rangle$ using time-independent perturbation theory, $a_{n_j}^j$ obeys a recursion relation [30]

$$a_{n_{j+1}}^{j+1} = (1 - p_{n_j}^j/2) a_{n_j}^j + \sum_{m_j \neq n_j} \alpha_{m_j n_j}^j a_{m_j}^j, \quad (7)$$

where $\alpha_{m_j n_j}^j = \langle m_j | \Delta t V_j | n_j \rangle / [E_{n_j} - E_{m_j}] + O(\Delta t^2)$ and $p_{n_j}^j = \sum_{m_j \neq n_j} |\alpha_{m_j n_j}^j|^2$ with $p_{0_j}^j \equiv p_j$. Since $|0_{\mathcal{M}}\rangle = |0\rangle$ at the end of a drive period, $|c_0|^2 = |\langle \psi_{\mathcal{M}} | 0 \rangle|^2 = |a_{0_{\mathcal{M}}}^{\mathcal{M}}|^2$. Using Eq. 7, one then obtains after some algebra $|c_0|^2 = \prod_{j=0}^{\mathcal{M}-1} (1 - p_j')$, where $p_j' = \text{Re}(p_{1_j}) - |p_{1_j}|^2/4$ and $p_{1_j} \simeq p_j - 2 \sum_{n=1, \mathcal{M}-j} \sum_{m_j \neq 0_j} \alpha_{m_j 0_j}^j \alpha_{m_j - n 0_j - n}^{j-n}$ [30]. This leads to

$$I(0) = -L^{-d} \sum_{j=0, \mathcal{M}-1} \ln(1 - p_j') \geq \sum_{j=0, \mathcal{M}-1} p_j'/L^d, \quad (8)$$

Next, we note that p_j' represents the change in the wavefunction overlap with the instantaneous ground state during the j^{th} evolution step: $|a_{0_{j+1}}^{j+1}/a_{0_j}^j|^2 = (1 - p_j')$ [30]. Thus $p = \sum_j p_j'/\mathcal{M}$ represents the probability of deviation of $|\psi_{\mathcal{M}}\rangle$ from $|0\rangle$ at the end of the drive cycle. The number of resultant excitations is $N_0 = \mathcal{M}p$ leading to $n_d = N_0/L^d$ [31]. This yields $I(0) \geq n_d$ (Eq. 8).

The relations $I(0) \geq n_d$ and $I(Q) = 0$ constitute the central results of this work. They relate $I(w)$ of a periodically driven quantum system to physically measurable quantities n_d and Q . These relations are universal;




FIG. 1: (Color online) Schematic representation of the phase diagram of the Ising (left) and the Kitaev (right) model showing multiple passage through the critical point/region during a drive cycle.

they hold irrespective of the system dimension, specific parameters of its Hamiltonian, and details of the periodic drive protocol. These details, encoded in H and ω_0 , determine n_d and Q ; however they do not alter the above-mentioned relations. We point out that for any drive protocol (not necessarily periodic), the rate function vanishes at $\bar{w} = \langle w \rangle / N$ [20, 21]; however, $\langle w \rangle / N$ can not be related to Q for such protocols. This equality of these two quantities stems from the drive periodicity leading to $H_f = H_i$ after a drive cycle.

Next, we compute $I(w)$ for d -dimensional integrable models described by $H_{\text{int}}(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \psi_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger H_{\mathbf{k}}(t) \psi_{\mathbf{k}}$, where $\psi_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger = (c_{1\mathbf{k}}^\dagger, c_{2\mathbf{k}}^\dagger)$ are fermionic creation operators and

$$H_{\mathbf{k}}(t) = \tau_3(\lambda_1(t) - b_{\mathbf{k}}) + \tau_1 g_{\mathbf{k}}. \quad (9)$$

Here τ_3 and τ_1 denote usual Pauli matrices while $b_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $g_{\mathbf{k}}$ are general functions of momenta. In what follows, we consider a periodic protocol $\lambda(t) = \lambda_0[1 + \cos(\omega_0 t)]$ and compute $I(w)$ for the model at end of one drive cycle.

In this context, we note that the Hamiltonian of Ising model is given by $H_{\text{Ising}} = -J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} S_i^z S_j^z - h \sum_i S_i^x$, where J is the nearest-neighbor coupling between the spins and h is the transverse field. It turns out that H_{Ising} reduces to H_{int} via Jordan-Wigner transformation [32, 33] with $\lambda_0 = g = h/J$, $b_k = \cos(k)$ and $g_k = \sin(k)$. Further, the Kitaev model, describing half integer spins on a 2D honeycomb lattice, has the Hamiltonian [33, 34]

$$H' = \sum_{j+\ell=\text{even}} J_1 S_{j,\ell}^x S_{j+1,\ell}^x + J_2 S_{j,\ell}^y S_{j-1,\ell}^y + J_3 S_{j,\ell}^z S_{j,\ell+1}^z,$$

where $J_{1,2,3}$ denote nearest neighbor coupling between the spins and the (j, ℓ) describe 2D lattice coordinates. It is well-known that H' can also be mapped to H_{int} via a 2D Jordan Wigner transformation [34] with $\lambda_0 = J_3$, $b_{\mathbf{k}} = (J_1 \cos(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{M}_1) + J_2 \cos(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{M}_2))$, and $g_{\mathbf{k}} = (J_1 \sin(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{M}_1) - J_2 \sin(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{M}_2))$. Here $\mathbf{M}_{1,2} = (\sqrt{3}/2, +(-)3/2)$ denote the spanning vectors of the reciprocal lattice of the model and we have set the lattice spacing to unity.

To obtain $I(w)$ for $H_{\text{int}}(t)$, we first note that the instantaneous eigenvalues of $H_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$ is given by $E_{\mathbf{k}}[\lambda(t)] = \pm \sqrt{(\lambda(t) - b_{\mathbf{k}})^2 + g_{\mathbf{k}}^2}$. Using this, we find that the model




FIG. 2: (Color online) Left: Plot of $I(w)$ as a function of w and ω_0 for the Ising model with $\lambda_0 = 1.5$. Right: Similar plot for the Kitaev model with $J_1 = J_2 = 1$ and $\lambda_0 = 2$.

passes through a critical point (line) in $d = 1$ ($d = 2$) where $g_{\mathbf{k}} = 0$ as shown schematically in Fig. 1. For $d = 1$, the critical point is reached twice for each cycle at $t_1 = \omega_0^{-1} \arccos(b_{k_0}/\lambda_0 - 1)$ and $t_2 = 2\pi/\omega_0 - t_1$, where $g_{k_0} = 0$. For $d = 2$, the critical region is traversed during time windows $t_i = \omega_0^{-1} \arccos(b_{\mathbf{k}_i}/\lambda_0 - 1)$ and $t'_i = 2\pi/\omega_0 - t_i$, where $\mathbf{k}_i$ satisfies $g_{\mathbf{k}_i} = 0$.

Let us consider the system described by H_{int} in its ground state $|\psi^{\text{gnd}}\rangle = \prod_{\mathbf{k}} |\psi_{\mathbf{k}}^{\text{gnd}}(0)\rangle$ at $t = 0$ with $|\psi_{\mathbf{k}}^{\text{gnd}}(0)\rangle = u_{\mathbf{k}}^0|0\rangle + v_{\mathbf{k}}^0|1\rangle$, where

$$u_{\mathbf{k}}^0[v_{\mathbf{k}}^0] = (1 + [-](2\lambda_0 - b_{\mathbf{k}})/2E_{\mathbf{k}}(\lambda_0))^{1/2}/\sqrt{2}, \quad (10)$$

and $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ denote the states $(1, 0) \equiv c_{1\mathbf{k}}^\dagger|\text{vac}\rangle$ and $(0, 1) \equiv c_{2\mathbf{k}}^\dagger|\text{vac}\rangle$ respectively for a given $\mathbf{k}$, with $|\text{vac}\rangle$ being the vacuum state for fermions. The corresponding excited state is given by $|\psi_{\mathbf{k}}^{\text{ex}}(0)\rangle = -v_{\mathbf{k}}^0|0\rangle + u_{\mathbf{k}}^0|1\rangle$. The state of the system at $t = t_f$ is given by $|\psi_{\mathbf{k}}(t_f)\rangle = u_{\mathbf{k}}|0\rangle + v_{\mathbf{k}}|1\rangle$, where the expressions for $u_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $v_{\mathbf{k}}$ can be obtained by solving the Schrodinger equation $i\hbar\partial_t|\psi_{\mathbf{k}}(t)\rangle = H_{\mathbf{k}}(t)|\psi_{\mathbf{k}}(t)\rangle$. Thus the wavefunction overlaps $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}} = \langle\psi_{\mathbf{k}}^{\text{gnd}}(0)|\psi_{\mathbf{k}}\rangle$ and $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}} = \langle\psi_{\mathbf{k}}^{\text{ex}}(0)|\psi_{\mathbf{k}}\rangle$ are given by

$$\alpha_{\mathbf{k}} = (u_{\mathbf{k}}^{*0}u_{\mathbf{k}} + v_{\mathbf{k}}^{*0}v_{\mathbf{k}}), \quad \gamma_{\mathbf{k}} = (u_{\mathbf{k}}^{*0}v_{\mathbf{k}} - v_{\mathbf{k}}^{*0}u_{\mathbf{k}}). \quad (11)$$

We note that one can express n_d and Q in terms of $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}$ as $n_d[Q](\omega_0) = \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} 1[2E_{\mathbf{k}}]|\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}|^2$. Further, using Eqs. 3 and 4, one obtains, in terms of the wavefunction overlaps,

$$f(u, \omega_0) = - \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \ln \left[|\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 + |\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 e^{-2E_{\mathbf{k}}(\lambda_0)u} \right], \quad (12)$$

where the integral is to be taken over the d -dimensional Brillouin zone. The corresponding rate function, $I(w, \omega_0)$ can be computed from Eq. 12 using Eq. 6; in particular, $I(0, \omega_0)$ is given by

$$I(0, \omega_0) = \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \ln(1 - |\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}|^2) \geq n_d(\omega_0), \quad (13)$$

where we have used the expression of $n_d(\omega_0)$.




FIG. 3: (Color online) Top Left: Plot of $I(0)$ (red dashed line) and n_d (blue solid line) for $d = 1$ Ising model as a function of ω_0 . Top right: Plot of Q as calculated directly (red solid line) and from $I(Q) = 0$ (black dots) as a function of ω_0 . Bottom panels: Similar plots for the $d = 2$ Kitaev model. All parameters are same as in Fig. 2.

Eq. 12 and 13, along with Eq. 6 reduces the task of computing task of computing $I(w)$ to computing γ_k . This can be done exactly, albeit numerically, for both the Kitaev and the Ising models as shown in Figs. 2 and 3. In Fig. 2, we find that for both the models, $I(w)$ is a non-monotonic function of ω_0 . Further in the left panels of Fig. 3, we confirm the validity of the bound $I(0) \geq n_d$ for both the models via explicit computation of $I(0, \omega_0)$ (Eq. 13) and $n_d(\omega_0)$. We also compute the position of zeros of $I(w, \omega_0)$ for several representative values of ω_0 ; a comparison of these values with the plot of $Q(\omega_0)$ confirms the result $I(Q) = 0$ (Fig. 3 right panels).

Finally, we relate the non-monotonic behavior of $I(w, \omega_0)$ to the Stuckelberg interference phenomenon. To this end, we focus on Ising model for which one can derive an analytical expression of γ_k using the adiabatic-impulse approximation [35, 36]. Within this approximation, excitation production for any k occurs in the impulse region near avoided level crossings; for the rest of the evolution, the system gathers an adiabatic phase factor. The calculation of these phase factors and excitation probabilities during passages through the critical point for any k is identical to that for a two-level system [35]. The final result can be expressed as follows. Consider, for any given k , p_k to be the defect formation probability during a single passage through the critical point [35, 36]

$$p_k = \exp(-2\pi\delta_k), \quad \delta_k = g_k^2/|d\lambda/dt|_{t=t_1}. \quad (14)$$

The expression for total defect formation probability, $|\gamma_k|^2$, at $t = t_f$ is given in terms of these quantities as

$$|\gamma_k|^2 = 4p_k(1 - p_k) \sin^2(\phi_k^{\text{st}}) \quad (15)$$

where $\phi_k^{\text{st}} = \xi_{2k} + \phi_k$ is the Stuckelbeg phase originating from the interference of parts of the system wavefunction




FIG. 4: (Color online) Left: Plot of $|\gamma_k|^2$ as a function of k for two representative values of $\omega_0 = 0.1$ [blue solid line (numerical) and brown dash-dotted line (analytical)] and 0.12 [red dashed line (numerical) black dashed line (analytical)]. Right: Similar plot for $d = 2$ Kitaev model with $k_x = 2$ for $\omega_0 = 0.65$ (red dashed line) and 0.25 (blue solid line).

at ground and excited states during the second passage through the critical point, $\xi_{2k} = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} 2E_k(t)dt'/\hbar$ is the phase acquired during passage between the critical point crossings at $t = t_1$ and t_2 , and $\phi_k = -\pi/4 + \delta_k[\ln(\delta_k) - 1] + \text{Arg}\Gamma(1 - i\delta_k)$ is the Stoke's phase [35–37].

From Eq. 15, we note that $|\gamma_k|^2 \sim 1$ provided $p_k \simeq 1/2$ and $\phi_k^{\text{st}} \simeq \pi/2$ for the same k ; otherwise it stays small. Since p_k depends on ω_0 through δ_k and $\sin^2(\phi_k^{\text{st}})$ is an oscillatory function of ω_0 , we expect periodic pattern of maxima and minima for $|\gamma_k|^2$ as a function of ω_0 . A plot of $|\gamma_k|^2$ vs k in the left (right) panel of Fig. 4 for $\omega_0 = 0.1$ and 0.12 demonstrates the above-mentioned effect for the Ising (Kitaev) model. The left panel of Fig. 4 plot also shows a qualitative match between the analytical (Eq. 15) and numerical (Eq. 11) expressions of $|\gamma_k|^2$. It is then obvious from Eqs. 12 and 13 that such a pattern of alternate maxima and minima will also show up in $I(w, \omega_0)$ since it depends on momentum integral of $|\gamma_k|^2$. Thus we find that the peaks (dips) of $I(w, \omega_0)$ arises from constructive(destructive) interference of the ground and excited state wavefunctions; it constitutes a manifestation of quantum interference phenomenon in shaping the statistics of work distribution.

The experimental verification of our work would involve measuring characteristics function $G(iu)$ leading to construction of $P(w)$ by using single qubit interferometry [38–40]. Such experiments involve spin 1/2 systems which are implemented using ion traps [38] or single two-level system [39] or array of nuclear spins [40, 41]. We suggest driving such a system a periodic protocol with frequency ω_0 for a time $T_0 = 2\pi/\omega_0$. Our theory predicts that the corresponding $I(w)$ shall vanish at $\bar{w} = Q$ and shall satisfy $I(0) \geq n_d$. We note that Q and n_d can be separately measured in these systems [42]. For large Ising arrays which harbors a critical point, we also predict that $I(w)$ would be an oscillatory function of ω_0 .

In conclusion, we have established that for a generic closed quantum system subjected to a periodic drive, the rate function at the end of a drive cycle satisfies $I(0) \geq n_d$ and $I(Q) = 0$. These relations are universal and do not

depend on system or protocol details as long the drive is periodic. We have also computed $I(w)$ for a class of integrable models where the drive takes such systems through intermediate critical points (regions). We have shown that $I(w)$ is an oscillatory function of ω_0 , linked this behavior to the Stuckelberg interference phenomenon, and suggested experiments to test our theory.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL: WORK DISTRIBUTION FOR GENERIC QUANTUM SYSTEMS

In this section of the supplementary material, we provide the details of the proof of the relation $I(0) \geq n_d$ for both integrable and generic non-integrable Hamiltonians subjected to a periodic drive.

We begin with a large class of integrable Hamiltonians for which the many-body wavefunction can be written in product form in some appropriate basis. This allows one to write

$$|\psi\rangle = \prod_{j=1,N} \sum_{i=1,M} c_i^j |n_i^j\rangle \quad (16)$$

Here the index i runs over all possible configurations of single particle states $|n_i\rangle$ while the index j denotes the many-body label which could either be spatial location of a system site or its momentum. For example, for the class of integrable models studied in the main text, j indicates the momentum index $\mathbf{k}$ while i takes value 1, 2 corresponding to the number of single particle states for each $\mathbf{k}$; for instance, one may have $c_1^{\mathbf{k}} = u_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $c_2^{\mathbf{k}} = v_{\mathbf{k}}$. The coefficients c_i^j satisfy $\sum_{i=1,M} |c_i^j|^2 = 1$ for each j . In what follows, we are going to choose a basis so that the ground state of the system corresponds to $c_i^j = \delta_{i1}$ for all j : $|\psi_{\text{gnd}}\rangle = \prod_{j=1,N} |n_1^j\rangle$. Note that this choice do not lead to loss of generality.

The wavefunction after a drive cycle is given $|\psi_f\rangle = \prod_{j=1,N} \sum_{i=1,M} d_i^j |n_i^j\rangle$. The overlap of $|\psi_f\rangle$ with the initial ground state wavefunction is given by

$$|\langle\psi_f|\psi_{\text{gnd}}\rangle|^2 = |c_0|^2 = \prod_{j=1,N} |d_1^j|^2 = \prod_{j=1,N} (1 - p_j) \quad (17)$$

where $p_j = \sum_{i=2,M} |d_i^j|^2$ denotes the probability of deviation from the ground state configuration for the index j . This result is used in the main text. The interpretation of p_j depends on the system at hand. For example, if j represents coordinates of a site of the system, it would indicate the probability of deviation from the ground state configuration at that site. Alternatively, if j represented momentum k , $p_j \equiv p_{\mathbf{k}}$ would be the probability of deviation corresponding to the momentum mode $\mathbf{k}$. The existence of non-zero p_j therefore indicates excitation production since it corresponds a finite probability of the system to be in a excited state. For integrable Hamiltonians,

these excitations correspond to quasiparticles; their total number is given by $N_0 = \sum_j p_j = Np$, where p is the average probability of excitation production. Thus the defect or excitation density of such systems are given by $n_d = Np/L^d$, where d is the dimensionality of the system and L is its linear dimension. From these considerations, using Eq. 17 and noting that $I(0) = -L^{-d} \ln |c_0|^2$, one finds

$$I(0) = -L^{-d} \sum_j \ln(1 - p_j) \geq NL^{-d} p = n_d \quad (18)$$

which yields the bound $I(0) \geq n_d$. Note that the equality holds if the system comes back perfectly to the ground state after the drive leading to $I(0) = n_d = 0$; this corresponds to perfect dynamic freezing.

We now generalize this result to generic non-integrable Hamiltonians where the many-body wavefunction can not be written as the product of single particle wavefunctions as in Eq. 16. To do this, we first consider the evolution operator $S = T_t(\exp[-i \int_0^{t_f} H(t') dt' / \hbar])$ as defined in the main text which controls the change of the many-body wavefunction during the drive. To compute this change, we first divide the evolution time $t_f = T_0 = 2\pi/\omega_0$ into $\mathcal{M}$ slices of width Δt : $T_0 = \mathcal{M}\Delta t$. A choice of small enough Δt allows one to write

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \prod_{j=1,\mathcal{M}} e^{-i \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} H(t') dt' / \hbar} \\ &\simeq \prod_{j=1,\mathcal{M}} e^{-i(H[\lambda(t_j)] + H[\lambda(t_{j-1})])\Delta t / 2\hbar}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where we have used the fact that for small enough Δt and a generic smooth protocol, $H[\lambda(t)]$, between intervals t_{j-1} and t_j , can be replaced by the average of its values at $t = t_j$ and t_{j-1} . This approximation is valid if $\partial_t H \Delta t / 2 \ll H$ at all times leading to

$$2\pi V_j \ll \mathcal{M} H_j \omega_0 \quad (20)$$

where $V_j = \partial_t H[\lambda(t)]|_{t=t_j}/2$ and we have used $\Delta t = 2\pi/(\mathcal{M}\omega_0)$. In this context, we note a couple of points. First the condition given in Eq. 20 can be satisfied for any smooth protocol by choosing a large enough $\mathcal{M}$ and second, the adiabatic limit for the drive can be obtained in this formalism by choosing $V_j \rightarrow 0$ for all j . In what follows we denote the eigenstates and eigenenergies of H_j by $|n_j\rangle$ and E_{n_j} respectively with the convention that the ground state is given by $|0_j\rangle$.

Let us now consider that the wavefunction $|\psi_j\rangle$ at $t = t_j$ can be expressed in the eigenbasis of H_j as $|\psi_j\rangle = \sum_{n_j} a_{n_j}^j |n_j\rangle$, where $a_{n_j}^j$ denotes the overlap of $|\psi_j\rangle$ with $|n_j\rangle$. Within each interval Δt , the evolution of $|\psi\rangle$ is determined by the time-independent Schrodinger equation with effective Hamiltonian $H_j + \Delta t V_j$ and can be estimated by time-independent perturbation theory

since $\Delta t V_j \ll H_j$ (Eq. 20). Consequently, one has

$$|n_{j+1}\rangle = (1 - p_{n_j}^j/2)|n_j\rangle + \sum_{m_j \neq n_j} \alpha_{m_j n_j}^j |m_j\rangle \quad (21)$$

$$\alpha_{m_j n_j}^j = \frac{\langle m_j | \Delta t V_j | n_j \rangle}{E_{m_j} - E_{n_j}} + O(\Delta t^2), \quad p_{n_j}^j = \sum_{m_j \neq n_j} |\alpha_{m_j n_j}^j|^2$$

We note that the formal requirement for the convergence of the second order perturbation theory used here is $|\alpha_{m_j n_j}^j| \ll 1$. This leads to an estimate of minimum value of $\mathcal{M}$. To see this, we first consider a typical many-body system where the minimum energy spacing between two states in the Hilbert space goes as $\exp[-N]$ where N denotes the number of sites in the system. So one needs $\mathcal{M} \geq \exp[N]$ for a generic protocol for such a perturbation theory to converge. In this context, we note two points. First, for slow dynamics, the system may only traverse low-lying excited states where the energy gap, in the presence of a critical point, goes as $\Delta E \sim N^{-z}$, where z is the dynamical critical exponent. For such protocols, it suffices to use $\mathcal{M} \sim N^z$. Second, our formal argument leading to the final result is completely independent of the precise choice of $\mathcal{M}$ as long as it is large enough for the perturbation theory to converge and, consequently, for $\alpha_{m_j n_j}^j$ and $p_{n_j}^j$ to remain small.

Since the wavefunction at $t = t_{j+1}$, $|\psi_{j+1}\rangle$, can be expressed as $|\psi_{j+1}\rangle = \sum_{n_{j+1}} a_{n_{j+1}}^{j+1} |n_{j+1}\rangle$, one can obtain, using Eq. 21, a recursion relation for $a_{n_j}^j$:

$$a_{n_{j+1}}^{j+1} = (1 - p_{n_j}^j/2)a_{n_j}^j + \sum_{m_j \neq n_j} \alpha_{m_j n_j}^j a_{m_j}^j. \quad (22)$$

Using the fact that the system starts in the ground state at $t = 0$ so that $a_{0_0}^0 = 1$ and $a_{m_0}^0 = 0$ for $m_0 \neq 0$, we can expand Eq. 22 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} a_{0_1}^1 &= (1 - p_0/2), \quad a_{m_1}^1 = \alpha_{m_0 0_0}^0 \\ a_{0_2}^2 &= (1 - p_0/2)(1 - p_1/2) + \sum_{m_1} \alpha_{m_0 0_0}^0 \alpha_{m_1 0_1}^1 \\ a_{m_2}^2 &= (1 - p_{m_1}^1/2)\alpha_{m_0 0_0}^0 + (1 - p_0/2)\alpha_{m_1 0_1}^1 \\ &\quad + \sum_{n_2 \neq m_2 \neq 0} \alpha_{n_1 m_1}^1 \alpha_{n_0 m_0}^0 \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where we have used $p_{0_j}^j \equiv p_j$. One can similarly obtain expressions for $a_{0_j}^j$ for $j > 2$ which gets increasingly cumbersome with increasing j .

The wavefunction overlap after $\mathcal{M}$ such step is given by $c_0 = \langle \psi_{\mathcal{M}} | 0 \rangle = a_{0_{\mathcal{M}}}^{\mathcal{M}}$. This is a consequence of the periodicity of the drive which leads to $|0_{\mathcal{M}}\rangle = |0_0\rangle \equiv |0\rangle$. Using Eq. 22 and 23, we obtain, after some algebra,

$$c_0 = \prod_{j=0}^{\mathcal{M}-1} (1 - p_j/2) + \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{M}-1} \sum_{n=1}^{\mathcal{M}-j} \alpha_{m_{j-n} 0_{j-n}}^{j-n} \alpha_{m_j 0_j}^j \quad (24)$$

where we have ignored terms $O(\Delta t^3)$ or higher. We note that c_0 is a complex valued polynomial function of $O(\mathcal{M})$

with $\mathcal{M}$ zeroes; consequently, it can always be written in the form $c_0 = \prod_{j=0, \mathcal{M}-1} (1 - p_{1j}/2)$.

To find an expression for p_{1j} , we first note that each term in the second sum in the right side of Eq. 24 is bounded. To see this we note that from Eq. 21, we have $\sum_{m_j \neq 0_j} |\alpha_{m_j 0_j}^j|^2 = p_j$. Thus one can write

$$\sum_{m_j \neq 0_j} \alpha_{m_j 0_j}^j \alpha_{m_{j-n} 0_{j-n}}^{j-n} = b_j^n e^{i\phi_j^n} \text{Max}[p_j, p_{j-n}] \quad (25)$$

where $0 \leq b_j^n \leq 1$. The precise value of b_j^n , ϕ_j^n etc depends on system parameters as well as the details of the drive protocol. However, since $p_j \sim O(\Delta t^2)$ for any j , one can see that $\sum_n \sum_{m_j \neq 0_j} \alpha_{m_j 0_j}^j \alpha_{m_{j-n} 0_{j-n}}^{j-n}$ is at most $O(\Delta t)$. Thus to $O(\Delta t^2)$, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} p_{1j} &\simeq p_j - 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\mathcal{M}-j} \sum_{m_j \neq 0_j} \alpha_{m_j 0_j}^j \alpha_{m_{j-n} 0_{j-n}}^{j-n} \\ |c_0|^2 &\simeq \prod_{j=0, \mathcal{M}-1} (1 - p'_j), \quad p'_j = \text{Re}[p_{1j}] - \frac{|p_{1j}|^2}{4} \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

which is the result used in the main text.

Next, we relate p'_j to the excitation density. To do this, we note that for any evolution step j , one can use Eqs. 22 and 23 to show that $a_{0_{j+1}}^{j+1} - a_{0_j}^j = -p_{1j}$ to $O(\Delta t^2)$. This leads to

$$|a_{0_{j+1}}^{j+1}/a_{0_j}^j|^2 = (1 - p'_j) \quad (27)$$

Since $a_{0_j}^j$ denote the probability amplitude of the system to be in the ground state $|0_j\rangle$, we find that p'_j denotes the change in the system wavefunction overlap with the instantaneous ground state during the j^{th} evolution step. Since we start from the ground state configuration at $t = 0$, the average probability of such deviation during the drive cycle is $p = \sum_{j=0, \mathcal{M}-1} p'_j / \mathcal{M}$; thus the total number of excitations in the system at the end of the drive is given by $N_0 = \mathcal{M}p$. In this context, we note a few points. First, since $|c_0| \leq 1$ for any unitary evolution, $\sum_j p'_j \geq 0$; however an individual p'_j can either be positive or negative since the system wavefunction overlap with the instantaneous ground state may increase or decrease during the drive at the j^{th} step. Second, in a generic non-integrable system, the nature of these excitations need not be quasiparticles-like; they could be, for example, non-local objects such as vortices or extended defects. Third, although p'_j depends on the choice of $\mathcal{M}$, $\sum_j p'_j$ and consequently N_0 is independent of such choice as long as $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies the criteria of convergence of perturbation theory discussed earlier. As $\mathcal{M}$ is increased beyond its minimum allowed value, $\sum_j p'_j$ is expected to converge to a fixed value independent of $\mathcal{M}$. Thus we find $n_d = N_0/L^d$. Using these results we finally get

$$I(0) = -L^{-d} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{M}} \ln(1 - p'_j) \geq L^{-d} N_0 = n_d \quad (28)$$

which is used in the main text. Note that for slow dynamics in a critical system with $z = 1$, one may choose $\mathcal{M} = N$ as discussed earlier leading to $\ln|c_0| \sim N$ which is known in the standard literature [27].

Finally, we consider generalization of our arguments for system in a thermal/non-equilibrium diagonal ensemble at $t = 0$ such that the probability of occupation of the state $|\alpha\rangle$ is $\rho_{0\alpha}$. Such a quantum system in an ensemble characterized by $\rho_{0\alpha}$, in contrast to the zero temperature case where one starts the time evolution starts from the initial ground state $|0\rangle$ at $t = 0$, has a finite weight in all states $|\alpha\rangle$. Thus the value of w can take both positive and negative values $E_\alpha - E_\beta$ which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} P(w) &= \sum_{\alpha\beta} P_{\alpha\rightarrow\beta} \delta(w - E_\beta + E_\alpha) \\ P_{\alpha\rightarrow\beta} &= P_\alpha^0 P_{\beta||\alpha} = \rho_{0\alpha} |\Lambda_{\alpha\beta}|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where $P_\alpha^0 = \rho_{0\alpha}$ is the probability that the system starts out in the state $|\alpha\rangle$ and $P_{\beta||\alpha}$ is the conditional probability that it ends up in the state $|\beta\rangle$ after a drive cycle having started from the state $|\alpha\rangle$. For a thermal ensemble, for example, $\rho_{0\alpha} = \exp(-\beta E_\alpha)/Z$, where E_α are the eigenenergies of the system satisfying $H[\lambda_0]|\alpha\rangle = E_\alpha|\alpha\rangle$, $\beta = (k_B T)^{-1}$ is the inverse temperature, k_B is the Boltzmann constant, and $Z = \sum_\alpha \exp(-\beta E_\alpha)$ is the partition function. The precise form of the occupation probability $\rho_{0\alpha}$ shall be irrelevant in our derivation. We shall, however, use the relation $\sum_\alpha \rho_{0\alpha} = 1$ which is generically true for any ensemble. Also, in what follows, we are going to concentrate on integrable systems for which $E_\alpha = \sum_j E^j n_\alpha^j$, where E^j are the single particle excitation energies corresponding to the mode j and n_α^j are the occupation number of the states with energy E^j ; consequently $\rho_{0\alpha} = \prod_{j=1,N} \rho_{0\alpha}^j$, where $\rho_{0\alpha}^j = \exp(-\beta E^j n_\alpha^j)/Z$.

Now let us imagine driving this system with periodic protocol for a time T_0 . At the end of this drive cycle, one can write $S|\alpha\rangle = \sum_\beta \Lambda_{\alpha\beta} |\beta\rangle$, where $\Lambda_{\alpha\beta}$ are the wavefunction overlap between the states $S|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\beta\rangle$. In this notation, $\Lambda_{1\beta} = c_\beta$ which is used in the main text and for any $|\alpha\rangle$, $\sum_\beta |\Lambda_{\alpha\beta}|^2 = 1$. After the drive, the conditional probability of the system to be in a state $|\beta\rangle$, provided it started from a state $|\alpha\rangle$ is given by $\langle\beta|S|\alpha\rangle|^2 = |\Lambda_{\alpha\beta}|^2$. For integrable models, such a wavefunction overlap can be written as $\Lambda_{\alpha\beta} = \prod_{j=1,N} \Lambda_{\alpha\beta}^j$, where $\Lambda_{\alpha\beta}^j$ correspond to the overlap of the j^{th} mode. Thus, starting from ensemble characterized by $\rho_{0\alpha}$, the probability of the system to return to the same configuration after a drive cycle, $|c_0|^2$, is given by

$$|c_0|^2 = \sum_\alpha \rho_{0\alpha} |\Lambda_{\alpha\alpha}|^2 = \prod_{j=1,N} \left[1 - \sum_{\beta \neq \alpha} \rho_{0\alpha}^j |\Lambda_{\alpha\beta}^j|^2 \right].$$

This leads to $p_j = \sum_{\beta \neq \alpha} \rho_{0\alpha}^j |\Lambda_{\alpha\beta}^j|^2$. Note that if the system started from a quantum ground state $|0\rangle$ at $T = 0$ (as in the main text), $\rho_{0\alpha} = \delta_{\alpha 1}$ and $|\Lambda_{11}^j|^2 = |d_{1j}|^2$, so

that one obtains $|c_0|^2 = \prod_{j=1,N} (1 - \sum_{i \neq 1} |d_{ij}|^2)$ in this limit. Next, we note that any deviation from the starting configuration of the system indicates change in quasiparticle number due to the drive; this is understood by appealing to the fact that such deviation represents energy absorption/emission by the system during the drive which occurs via quasiparticle production in integrable systems. In contrast to the system at $T = 0$, the change in quasiparticle number can be negative in this case; however, the absolute value of this change is still given by $Np_0 = \sum_j p_j$. Thus one can define a defect density $n_d = Np_0/L^d$, where N is the total number of degrees of freedom in the system and L is its linear dimension as defined in the main text. This leads to the bound $I(0) \neq n_d$ for integrable systems in a thermal or diagonal non-equilibrium ensemble. We note that our definition of n_d here matches with that in standard literature [1]

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL: EQUILIBRIUM PHASE DIAGRAM OF THE ISING AND THE KITAIEV MODEL

In this section, we provide a brief introduction to the equilibrium phase diagram of the Ising and the Kitaev models. These are already discussed at length in standard literature [32, 34]. Here we briefly outline the main points which would be useful in our discussion of the periodic dynamics of these models in the main text.

The 1D Ising model in the presence of a transverse field has a Hamiltonian given in Eq. 11 of the main text

$$H_{\text{Ising}} = -J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} S_i^z S_j^z - h \sum_i S_i^x, \quad (30)$$

where J is the nearest-neighbor coupling between the spins and h is the transverse field and S^α denotes half-integer spins. The exact solution of this model leading to its ground state for any value of dimensionless transverse field $g = h/J$ can be obtained mapping the spins to fermions via a Jordan-Wigner transformation [32]

$$\sigma_i^x = (1 - 2c_i^\dagger c_i), \quad \sigma_i^z = \left(\prod_{j < i} \sigma_j^x \right) (c_i + c_i^\dagger) \quad (31)$$

Substituting Eq. 31 in Eq. 30, one obtain the Ising Hamiltonian in terms of the free fermions: $H = \sum_{k>0} \psi_k^\dagger H_k \psi_k$, where $\psi_k \equiv (c_{1k}, c_{2k})^T = (c_k, c_{-k}^\dagger)^T$, $c_k = \sum_j \exp[ikj] c_j$, H_k is given by

$$H_k = [g - \cos(k)]\tau_z + \sin(k)\tau_x, \quad (32)$$

and we have set the lattice spacing to unity. Since Eq. 32 represents a free fermion Hamiltonian, its eigenvalues can be readily found out by diagonalizing H_k and are given by $E_k^\pm = \pm \sqrt{1 + g^2 - 2g \cos(k)}$. The phases of

the model can be understood in this language as follows. For $g \gg 1$, the ground state corresponds to the Fermion vacuum which corresponds to (Eq. 31) $S_x^i = \hbar/2$ on every lattice site; this is the paramagnetic phase of the model. For $g \ll 1$, the ground state is an eigenstate of σ_z which in the fermionic language is linear superposition of c_k and $c_{-k}^\dagger$; this corresponds to the ferromagnetic state [32]. In between at $g = 1$, there is a quantum phase transition between these two states which can be seen, in the fermionic language, by noticing that the energy gap $\Delta_k = (E_k^+ - E_k^-)$ vanishes at $g = 1$ and $k = 0$ signifying a gapless spectrum at this point.

The Kitaev model, describing half integer spins on a 2D honeycomb lattice, has the Hamiltonian [34]

$$H' = \sum_{j+\ell=\text{even}} J_1 S_{j,\ell}^x S_{j+1,\ell}^x + J_2 S_{j,\ell}^y S_{j-1,\ell}^y + J_3 S_{j,\ell}^z S_{j,\ell+1}^z, \quad (33)$$

where $J_{1,2,3}$ denote nearest neighbor coupling between the spins, (j, ℓ) describe 2D lattice coordinates, and $S_{j,\ell}^\alpha$ for $\alpha = x, y, z$ denotes half-integer spins. Note that the basic difference of this model with, for example, the anisotropic Heisenberg model, is that the coupling between a pair of spins on the neighboring sites of the lattice in the α^{th} direction involves only $S_{j,\ell}^\alpha$. This feature makes the model solvable; in fact, the Kitaev model constitutes one of the very few examples of a solvable interacting quantum model in $d > 1$.

The steps to solving of H' proceeds in the same manner as those of the 1D Ising chain. First, one designs a Jordan Wigner transformation relating the spins $S_{j,\ell}^\alpha$ to Majorana fermion operators [34]

$$\begin{aligned} a_{j\ell}[a'_{j\ell}] &= \left(\prod_{i=-\infty}^{j-1} \sigma_{i\ell}^z \right) \sigma_{j\ell}^y [\sigma_{j\ell}^x] \quad \text{for even } j + \ell \\ b_{j\ell}[b'_{j\ell}] &= \left(\prod_{i=-\infty}^{j-1} \sigma_{i\ell}^z \right) \sigma_{j\ell}^x [\sigma_{j\ell}^y] \quad \text{for odd } j + \ell \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Substituting Eq. 34 in Eq. 33, one obtains a fermionic Hamiltonian given by

$$H_0 = i \sum_{\vec{n}} J_1 a_{\vec{n}} b_{\vec{n}+\vec{M}_1} + J_2 a_{\vec{n}} b_{\vec{n}+\vec{M}_2} + J_3 D_{\vec{n}} a_{\vec{n}} b_{\vec{n}} \quad (35)$$

where $\vec{n} = \sqrt{3}n_1\hat{i} + n_2\sqrt{3}\hat{j} + \hat{j}/2$ denotes midpoints of the vertical bonds, n_1 and n_2 run over all integers, $\hat{i}$ and $\hat{j}$ denote unit vectors along x and y directions, $\vec{M}_{1,2} = (\sqrt{3}/2, +(-)3/2)$ denote the spanning vectors of the reciprocal lattice of the model and we have set the lattice spacing to unity. Here $D_{\vec{n}} = a_{\vec{n}}' b_{\vec{n}}'$ and can take value ± 1 for each n . The key point that makes the Kitaev model exactly solvable is that $D_{\vec{n}}$ commutes with H_0 ; thus one can find the energy spectrum corresponding to a set of given values of $D_{\vec{n}}$. As shown in Ref. 34, the

ground state corresponds to $D_{\vec{n}} = 1$ on all links. Further, since $D_{\vec{n}}$ commutes with H_0 its values does not change on making H time dependent via $J_3 \rightarrow J_3(t)$. Thus, for our purpose, it would be sufficient to set $D_{\vec{n}} = 1$. A Fourier transform of H_0 then leads to $H_0 = \sum_{\vec{k}} \psi_{\vec{k}}^\dagger H_{\vec{k}} \psi_{\vec{k}}$, where $\psi_{\vec{k}} \equiv (c_{1\vec{k}}, c_{2\vec{k}})^T = (a_{\vec{k}}, b_{\vec{k}})^T$, $a_{\vec{k}}$ and $b_{\vec{k}}$ denote complex fermions so that the sum over $\vec{k}$ is to be taken over half of the 2D Brillouin zone, and $H_{\vec{k}}$ is given by

$$H_{\vec{k}} = (\lambda_0 - b_{\vec{k}})\tau_3 + g_{\vec{k}}\tau_1 \quad (36)$$

where $\lambda_0 = J_3$, $b_{\vec{k}} = (J_1 \cos(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{M}_1) + J_2 \cos(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{M}_2))$, and $g_{\vec{k}} = (J_1 \sin(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{M}_1) - J_2 \sin(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{M}_2))$.

The energy spectrum of the model can be obtained by diagonalization of $H_{\vec{k}}$ and is given by $E_{\vec{k}}^\pm = \pm \sqrt{(\lambda_0 - b_{\vec{k}})^2 + g_{\vec{k}}^2}$. The phases of the model consists of a gapless phase where $\Delta_{\vec{k}} = (E_{\vec{k}}^+ - E_{\vec{k}}^-) = 0$; this occurs at $\vec{k} = \vec{k}_0$ satisfying $\lambda_3 = b_{\vec{k}_0}$ and $g_{\vec{k}_0} = 0$. The gapless phase occurs when $(J_1 + J_2) \geq J_3 \geq |J_1 - J_2|$. For all other values of the coupling, the model exhibits gapped ground states as shown in Fig. 1 of the main text. The properties of these phases are discussed in details in Ref. 34. The main notable point for us about them is that they do not correspond to any local spin order and constitute examples of gapped and gapless Z_2 spin liquids.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL: STUCKELBERG INTERFERENCE PHENOMENON

The Stuckelberg interference phenomenon usually refers to quantum mechanical interference between amplitudes of occupation of energy levels of a two-level system upon multiple passages through its avoided level crossing [35]. Such passages usually occur for periodic drive protocols; in what follows we are going to consider a protocol which leads to two passages of the system through such an avoided level crossing. Under such a protocol, the system, starting from the ground state (lower level) at $t = t_0$ when the drive commences, transfer part of its amplitude to the upper level upon first passage through the avoided level crossing. The interference between these two amplitudes (probability amplitudes of occupation of the upper and lower levels) on the second passage leads to an oscillatory behavior of the probability of defect formation: $P_1 = 4P(1 - P)\sin^2 \phi^{\text{st}}$, where P denotes the probability of the system to be in the excited state after the first passage, and ϕ^{st} is the Stuckelberg phase which depends on the drive frequency and amplitude. Usually, this phase has two parts; the first, ξ originates from the relative phase picked up by the system in between its passages through the avoided level crossing, while the second, ϕ , known as the Stokes's phase, is picked up during the second passage through

the avoided level crossing: $\phi^{\text{st}} = \phi + \xi$ [35]. An analytical description of this phenomenon leading to the expression of P_1 presented above is not exact; it requires the so called adiabatic-impulse approximation and has been detailed in Ref. [35]. Within this approximation, the transition between the two levels occur only near the avoided level crossing; the rest of the evolution of the system is assumed to be near-adiabatic. This approximation captures the essential qualitative aspects of this phenomenon and is also quantitatively accurate for large amplitudes and/or low frequency drive protocols. Also, for a class of drives which corresponds to a series of rectangular periodic pulses, this approximation becomes exact.

Next, we briefly outline the derivation of p_k and ϕ_k^{st} which is used in Eqs. 17 and 18 of the main text. To this end, we note that the Ising model, discussed in the main text, reduces to a series of two-level systems with each k and thus the results of Ref. 35 can be directly adapted. We begin by assuming that the Ising model is in its ground state which, in the fermionic representation, corresponds to $|\psi_k^0\rangle = u_k^0|0\rangle + v_k^0|1\rangle$ for each k , where $|0\rangle \equiv (1, 0) \equiv c_{1k}^\dagger|\text{vac}\rangle$, $|1\rangle \equiv (0, 1) \equiv c_{2k}^\dagger|\text{vac}\rangle$, and $|\text{vac}\rangle$ denotes fermionic vacuum. The corresponding excited state is given by $|\psi_k^1\rangle = -v_k^0|0\rangle + u_k^0|1\rangle$. The Hamiltonian of the system is given by Eq. 10 of the main text. We now consider evolution of the system under a oscillatory drive protocol given by $\lambda(t) = \lambda_0[1 + \cos(\omega_0 t)]$. We note that under this protocol the system passes through the critical points at $\omega_0 t_1 = \arccos(b_{k_0}/\lambda_0 - 1)$ and $t_2 = 2\pi/\omega_0 - t_1$, where k_0 is the critical wave-vector at which the gap closes. For the $d = 1$ Ising model in a transverse field, $k_0 = 0$.

The wavefunction of the system at a time t can be written as

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = b_{1k}(t)|\psi_k^0\rangle + b_{2k}(t)|\psi_k^1\rangle \quad (37)$$

where $b_k = (b_{1k}(t), b_{2k}(t))$ can be found out by solving the Schrodinger equation with the initial condition $b_k(t = t_0) = (1, 0)$ [35]. The exact analytical solution for $b_k(t)$ does not exist for the protocol studied here; however, an approximate solution within the adiabatic-impulse approximation can be found out following the method outlined in Ref. 35. Within this approximation, the evolution of b_k gets contribution from two parts. The first is a phase gathered during adiabatic evolution away from the avoided level crossing. This is described by U_k given by

$$U_k(t, t') = I e^{i\tau_3 \xi_k(t, t')}, \quad \xi_k(t, t') = \frac{1}{2} \int_{t'}^t E(t'') dt'', \quad (38)$$

where $E_k(t)$ denotes the instantaneous eigenenergy corresponding to the wavevector k and τ_i , for $i = 1, 2, 3$, are the Pauli matrices with the convention that $(1, 0)^T$ is the

eigenfunction of τ_3 . The second contribution to b_k comes during passage of the system through the critical point where the dynamics is no longer adiabatic and defect formation occurs. Around this point, it is possible to linearize the drive term: $\lambda(t) \simeq (t - t_a) d\lambda(t)/dt|_{t=t_a}$, where t_a denotes the time when the system passes through the critical point; consequently, the dynamics reduces to an effective LZ problem for each k and can be exactly solved. The contribution to $b_k(t)$ due to passage through such avoided level crossing is described by the matrix N_k given by [35]

$$\begin{aligned} N_k &= \sqrt{1 - p_k} e^{i\tau_3 \phi_k} - i\tau_2 \sqrt{p_k}, \\ p_k &= \exp(-2\pi\delta_k), \quad \delta_k = g_k^2 / |d\lambda/dt|_{t=t_1} \\ \phi_k &= -\pi/4 + \delta_k [\ln(\delta_k) - 1] + \text{Arg}\Gamma(1 - i\delta_k), \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where p_k is the probability of excitation production upon a single passage through a critical point and ϕ_k is the Stoke's phase for a given k . In terms of these matrices, one can write [35]

$$b_k(t_f) = U_k(t_f, t_2) N_{2k} U_k(t_2, t_1) N_{1k} U_k(t_1, t_i) b_k(t_i) \quad (40)$$

A few lines of straightforward algebra then yields

$$\begin{aligned} b_{1k}(t_f) &= [(1 - p_k) e^{-i\xi_{+k}} - p_k e^{-i\xi_{-k}}] e^{-i\xi_k(t_1, t_i)} \\ b_{2k}(t_f) &= \sqrt{p_k(1 - p_k)} e^{i\phi_k} (e^{-i\xi_{+k}} + e^{-i\xi_{-k}}) \\ \xi_{+k} &= \xi_k(t_2, t_1) + \xi(t_1 + 2\pi/\omega_0, t_2) + 2\phi_k \\ \xi_{-k} &= \xi_k(t_2, t_1) - \xi(t_1 + 2\pi/\omega_0, t_2) \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where we have assumed that the system starts its evolution at $t = t_i$, ends it at $t = t_f$, and crosses the critical point at $t = t_1$ and t_2 . Within the adiabatic-impulse approximation, $u_k \equiv u_k(t_f)$ and $v_k \equiv v_k(t_f)$ is therefore given by

$$\begin{aligned} u_k(t_f) &= u_k^0 b_{1k}(t_f) - v_k^0 b_{2k}(t_f) \\ v_k(t_f) &= u_k^0 b_{2k}(t_f) + v_k^0 b_{1k}(t_f) \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

The total defect formation probability can now be obtained using Eqs. 42 and 41

$$\begin{aligned} p_k &= |\gamma_k|^2 = |b_{2k}(t_f)|^2 = 4p_k(1 - p_k) \sin^2(\phi_k^{\text{st}}) \\ \phi_k^{\text{st}} &= \phi_k + \xi_k(t_2, t_1), \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

which is Eq. 18 of the main text. Here we have used Eq. 14 of the main text for definition of γ_k . We note that the frequency dependence of the Stuckelberg phase arises out of the dependence of ϕ_k^{st} on δ_k and ξ_k , both of which depend on ω_0 through $\lambda(t)$. The details of this dependence is discussed in details in the main text.

[1] A. Polkovnikov, K. Sengupta, A. Silva, and M. Vengalattore, Rev. Mod. Phys., **83**, 863 (2011).

- [2] J. Dziarmaga, Adv. Phys. **59**, 1063 (2010).
- [3] A. Dutta, U. Divakaran, D. Sen, B. K. Chakrabarti, T. F. Rosenbaum, and G. Aeppli, arXiv:1012.0653 (unpublished)
- [4] S. Sachdev, K. Sengupta, and S.M. Girvin, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 075128 (2002).
- [5] M. Greiner, O. Mandel, T. Esslinger, T. W. Hansch, and I. Bloch, Nature **415**, 39 (2002).
- [6] I. Bloch, J. Dalibard, and W. Zwerge, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 885 (2008).
- [7] W. S. Bakr, A. Peng, M. E. Tai, R. Ma, J. Simon, J. I. Gillen, S. Folling, L. Pollet, and M. Greiner, Science **329**, 547 (2010).
- [8] Y. S. Patil, L. M. Aycock, S. Chakram, M. Vengalattore, arXiv:1404.5583 (unpublished).
- [9] K. Sengupta, S. Powell and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 053616 (2004).
- [10] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, J. of Stat. Mech.: Theor. and Experiment **2005**, P04010 (2005); *ibid.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 136801 (2006).
- [11] T. W. B. Kibble, J. Phys. A **9**, 1387 (1976); W. H. Zurek, Nature (London) **317**, 505 (1985); A. Polkovnikov, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 161201(R) (2005).
- [12] D. Sen, K. Sengupta and S. Mondal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 016806 (2008); S. Mondal, K. Sengupta, and D. Sen, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 045128 (2009).
- [13] K. Sengupta, D. Sen and S. Mondal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 077204 (2008); S. Mondal, D. Sen, and K. Sengupta, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 045101 (2008).
- [14] U. Divakaran, A. Dutta and D. Sen, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 144301 (2008).
- [15] A. Das, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 172402 (2010); S. Bhattacharyya, A. Das, and S. Dasgupta, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 054410 (2012).
- [16] S. Mondal, D. Pekker, and K. Sengupta, Europhys. Lett. **100**, 60007 (2011).
- [17] A. Lazarides, A. Das, and R. Moessner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 150401 (2014).
- [18] H. Touchette, R. Leidl and A. K. Hartmann (eds), *Modern Computational Science 11: Lecture Notes from the 3rd International Oldenburg Summer School*, BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, (2011).
- [19] H. Touchette, Phys. Rep. **478**, 1 (2009).
- [20] A. Silva, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 120603 (2008); A. Gambassi and A. Silva, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 250602 (2012); S. Sotiriadis, A. Gambassi, and A. Silva, Phys. Rev. E **87**, 052129 (2013).
- [21] P. Smacchia and A. Silva, Phys. Rev. E **88**, 042109 (2013).
- [22] M. Heyl and S. Keherin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 190601 (2012).
- [23] G. Verley, C. Van den Broeck, and M. Esposito, Phys. Rev. E **88** 032137 (2013).
- [24] Note that the equality in the last relation holds only if $|\psi(t)\rangle$ has a perfect overlap with the initial ground state, in which case $f(u) = 0$ for all u leading to $P(w) \sim \delta(w)$; a situation very close to this happens if the system exhibits perfect dynamic freezing [15, 16].
- [25] The most general form of the Gartner-Ellis theorem yields $I(\bar{w}) = -\text{Inf}[u\bar{w} - f(u)]$, where Inf stands for Infimum [18]. However, if $f'[u]$ exists, this definition of $I(\bar{w})$ coincides with the one given in Eq. 6.
- [26] The solution is obtained by setting $\bar{w} = 0$ and then taking $u[\bar{w}] \rightarrow \infty$ so that $\bar{w}u[\bar{w}] \rightarrow 0$.
- [27] M. M. Rams and B. Damski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 055701 (2011); H-Q Zhou, R. Orus, and G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 080601 (2008); H-Q Zhou and J. P. Barjaktarevic, J. Phys. A, **41**, 412001 (2008).
- [28] See supplementary material for a more detailed derivation.
- [29] M. Rigol, B. S. Shastri, and S. Haas Phys. Rev. B **80**, 094529 (2009); C. de Grandi, V. Gritsev, and A. Polkovnikov, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 012303 (2010).
- [30] See supplementary materials for a detailed proof of this statement.
- [31] As explained in the supplementary material, $\sum_j p'_j \geq 0$ and is independent of $\mathcal{M}$ in the $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \infty$ limit. Also, the excitations represented by p'_j , in contrast to those for integrable models, need not be local quasiparticles, but could be, for example, non-local objects such as defects, vortices or other collective modes.
- [32] See for example, S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1999).
- [33] See supplementary material for a discussion of the equilibrium phases of these spin models.
- [34] A. Kitaev, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **321**, 2 (2006); X.-Y. Feng, G.-M. Zhang, and T. Xiang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 087204 (2007).
- [35] S.N. Shevchenko, S. Ashhab, F. Nori, Phys. Rept. **492**, 1 (2010).
- [36] See supplementary materials for an introduction to the Stuckelberg interference phenomenon and a sketch of the derivation of p_k within adiabatic-impulse approximation.
- [37] It turns out that for a periodic protocol which constitutes a series of step functions, the adiabatic-impulse approximation becomes exact.
- [38] R. Dornier, S. R. Clark, L. Heaney, R. Fazio, J. Goold, and V. Vedral, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 230601 (2010).
- [39] L. Mazzola, G. De Chiara, and M. Paternostro, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 230602 (2010).
- [40] T. Batalho, A. M. Souza, L. Mazzola, R. Auccaise, R. S. Sarthour, I. S. Oliveira, J. Goold, G. De Chiara, M. Paternostro, and R. M. Serra, arXiv:1308.3241 (unpublished).
- [41] S. Hegde, H. Katiyar, T. S. Mahesh, and A. Das, arXiv:1307.8219 (unpublished).
- [42] For example, for few-spin system, n_d can be read off from the number of spins deviating from the ground state configuration; for a two-level system it involves measuring occupation probability of the upper level.